

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 10662 of 1994

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.R.BRAHMBHATT

- =====
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : YES
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
 3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO
 4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO
 5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates, Judge/Judges, Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

V.H.GHODASARA

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 10662 of 1994
MR MD RANA for Petitioner No. 1
MR HD RANA for Petitioner No. 1
MR. S.S. PATEL, LD. AGP for Respondent No. 1
MS SEJAL K MANDAVIA for Respondent No. 2
-

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.R.BRAHMBHATT

Date of decision: 16/12/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Neither Mr. M.D. Rana nor Mr. H.D. Rana learned counsel for the petitioner have appeared.

2. Heard Ms. Tejal Shah for Ms. Sejal Mandavia for respondent no.2 and Mr. S.S. Patel, learned AGP for respondent no.1.

3. This matter was listed for final disposal on 13-12-2004. At that time no one appeared on behalf of the petitioner and therefore, in the interest of justice the matter was adjourned so as to enable the petitioner to appear through his lawyer. It was specifically observed in the order dated 13-12-2004 by the Court that the matter is adjourned with a specific observation that on the next date of hearing matter will be disposed of even if no one appears on behalf of the petitioner. Today, when the matter is called out no one is present on behalf of the petitioner. It has been pointed out that this Court (Coram: Mr. Justice M.R. Calla) had passed an order dated 28-10-1994 that respondents should pass orders in respect of petitioner's reinstatement within a period of two weeks from the date the certified copy of the order is issued. None of the respondents who are present are in a position to answer as to what happened pursuant to the order dated 28-10-1994. In view of this the Court has no option but to treat this matter as having become infructuous. The matter is accordingly disposed of as having become infructuous, with a liberty to the petitioner to revive the same in case of difficulty. Rule is discharged. Ad interim relief, if any, stands vacated, with no order as to costs.

Dt: 16-12-2004

(S.R. BRAHMBHATT, J)

/vgn